

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

September 21, 2004

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sysyn, Guinta (late), Smith, Forest, O'Neil

Messrs.: Fire Chief Kane, K. Clougherty, Police Chief Jaskolka, T. Bechert, Deputy Solicitor Arnold, T. Lolicata, H. Ntapalis, F. Rusczech, G. Freije, L. LaFreniere

Chairman Sysyn stated we have an item of new business that we will take up first.

Request from Chief Kane to be relieved of his directive to spend 98% of his allocation so that they can explore restoring staffing for their out of service ladder trucks during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Chairman Sysyn stated Kevin Clougherty is here and he can explain to us what he thinks we should do on that. This also involves Item 3. Do you think we should take them together?

Mr. Kevin Clougherty stated both items deal with requests to get some relief from the 98% rule with respect to this year's budget. What we would ask the Committee to recommend is, first of all we understand where the departments are coming from. We think it is important that they get on the record with respect to their needs and inform you in terms of what the impact of these cuts could be. That being said, our intention when we set the budget was to get to the tax rate season so that we would know where we were with respect to the tax rate. As you know, the whole reason for putting in the 98% curfew, if you will on spending, was to try and make sure that we were able to live within the tax forecast in light of some of the uncertainty that we had at the time with the State. We now have some better information from the State, which turned out to be good information. It is a little bit higher. We have gotten some better information from the School District in terms of what is going on with its fund balance and we will be setting the tax rate in another month or so. We would hope that until that time you would instruct the Board or instruct the departments to go ahead and certainly meet the requirements of the Verizon safety stuff and do what the Chief needs to do with his truck understanding that we will revisit this issue when we set the tax rate. It

may be that we don't have to ask the departments to do a 98% cut. Maybe it is only a 1% cut instead of a 2% cut. It may be that some of the other things come our way in terms of the valuation. We are still waiting on that number. To the extent that we can provide relief at that time, we will do it. The other issue we have is you may recall we went through a similar circumstance with Welfare and other departments in past years and what we have done is asked them to move forward with their spending. Remember the departments have, at this point, only expired two months out of their full year's appropriation so it is not like you need to transfer some more money in for them to operate. As we are going through with the Committee on Accounts and looking at these departments' spending patterns every month and every quarter, if there comes the need later in the year to transfer some dollars in, it may be that we don't have to transfer the whole amount, for example, of the Verizon extra detail. It may be that we have to deal with just a part of that because we have had production and demand in services in other areas. As we look at that going forward we will certainly be able to make transfers to accommodate the needs of the service levels but moving dollars at this point is not something we would ask you to do.

Chairman Sysyn stated we want to discuss Chief Kane's request first. You are recommending the same for Chief Kane?

Mr. Clougherty responded right on both cases. I think we are early in the budget. They have some issues that are understandable but we would ask at this point in time that they try to live within the parameters of what we have talked about understanding that we can make adjustments once the tax rate is set and we think we are getting better news on the tax rate right now and hopefully we can provide some comfort to departments.

Alderman O'Neil stated Kevin I want to make sure I am interpreting what I think you are saying. Are you saying that your recommendation at this time would be that they can provide those services?

Mr. Clougherty responded yes I think those are important services that they should be providing but we are still going to try to live within the 98% understanding that that might be adjusted in another month or so. For the next few months certainly they should keep on schedule and keep trying to stay within that 98%.

Alderman Forest asked Kevin are you recommending that we vote to bring this to the full Board.

Mr. Clougherty responded if you are going to give a report to the full Board my recommendation would be that you have them go forward and do the services but

not transfer the funding at this time. We will deal with the funding issue as part of the tax rate.

Alderman Smith stated Kevin there is also another department that sent a letter to us, the Assessors I believe. It seems like a domino affect.

Mr. Clougherty responded I am sure everybody will be sending you letters and I think if the Board can send out a clear directive that we are going to be looking at this in another month and let's wait until we get the numbers for the tax rate set it would be helpful.

Chairman Sysyn stated the Assessors letter should go to Human Resources. It shouldn't come to us anyway. This is a safety issue when you are talking about the Police and Fire Departments.

Alderman Smith replied it is still a request.

Chairman Sysyn stated but it is going to go...

Alderman Smith interjected my point is when will the tax rate be set by the DRA.

Mr. Clougherty stated we are looking to have our information up to them in the middle of or end of October and we should set the tax rate as we usually do as early as we can in November. That is provided the information is available from the School District and from the Assessors.

Alderman Smith asked in regards to the Accounts Committee, which I am Chairman of, we discussed this before. You are going to bring up any department that is not following the parameters, even if we waive this, that they can't adhere to this?

Mr. Clougherty answered yes. You are going to see what the differences are and be able to make those decisions as you are going forward. Again hopefully Alderman once we set the tax rate it won't be as part of an edict on the department. It won't be 98%. Maybe it will be 99%. We are hoping that we can get to that and still be able to do what has to be done.

Alderman Smith stated my point is that the services needed in this City not only include Police and Fire. There are definite services that like the Highway Department when it starts snowing needs and I just want every department treated fairly.

Mr. Clougherty responded from the Committee on Accounts you know that every month we come in and give you a report that shows what the department's budgets are, what they have spent to date and what the balance is and how that is compared to the previous year. So you can take a look at that and track and we will know very early on any departments that are varying from that level and we will be able to address that and make the necessary adjustments going forward. Every year depending on circumstances...some years we may see that Highway has a balance and some years if the demand isn't on safety services there is a balance there. So it is hard to predict which department that is going to show up in but it invariably ends up with about a 1% or 2% turn back each year so we will be monitoring for that and you will be getting those reports.

Alderman DeVries stated Kevin once again what you are saying for the Fire Department is that you are recommending that he put his ladder trucks back in service.

Mr. Clougherty responded I am saying with respect to the Fire Department that he has to make some decisions regarding his 98% and he has to make those decisions going forward for the next month or so until we get the tax rate set. At that point in time he should be able to make some determinations hopefully that are going to be easier given what the demand is on the department in terms of how he is going to do his complement.

Alderman DeVries replied I would like to take that a little bit further and I realize that we will have this discussion once again at the full Board level but I think it might be worthwhile to hear from Chief Kane because I am not sure how...their manpower cycles run in eight week increments so it has to be timed to fit with that increment as well as their ability to save where they have mandatory staffing would be during the summer months I am sure. I just want to make sure this Committee has a clear message of what is actually being sent here.

Fire Chief Joseph Kane stated I am not exactly sure if I know what I heard myself. Let me see if I can redo this for you Kevin. What I heard was that the department will stay within the 98% until sometime in the beginning of November when the tax rate will be set and at that time you would like to revisit this issue.

Mr. Clougherty responded that is right.

Chief Kane stated so when you are saying that you would like me to put the trucks back in service but you also said that you want me to put the trucks back in service and stay within the 98% and maybe in November once the tax rate is set then we can relook at the issue.

Mr. Clougherty responded right and I am sorry if that wasn't clear but that is what we are recommending.

Alderman O'Neil asked Chief are there days that you have enough bodies to put those trucks back into service.

Chief Kane stated there are days because of vacations where we might be able to put those trucks back in service on a day-to-day basis but some days we can and some days we don't.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is something I would encourage you to do if you had the manpower even if it is for a shift put them back in service. That is not necessarily a new practice. That is something we have used in the past.

Chief Kane responded right but the issues that come up there is that the people that we have extra, the floaters, are basically the rookies that have less than a year and they are not really trained to our operations.

Alderman O'Neil asked so what are we doing with all of the extra people then if we have extra people on a shift.

Chief Kane answered well basically like Station 5 and Station 2 where we have taken people out of that station we would put four people on an engine so that instead of them hitting fire with an engine and truck and five people they are basically hitting the fire with the engine and four people. So that area account we try to beef up the response there.

Alderman O'Neil asked so there is no time you have enough experienced people to put those trucks back into service without using overtime.

Chief Kane answered that would be correct because all of the floaters are rookies.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to clarify something for my own purpose. What I am hearing is I don't believe and correct me if I am wrong Kevin or anybody that if you want to make the decision to put those ladders back into service that is up to you, Chief, as well as the Chief of Police on the services that you want to provide the City understanding that the 98% is still there that you could possibly make that up somewhere along the line with vacancies or people on active duty...whatever the case may be. Only you know and the Chief of Police know exactly what is transpiring. I don't believe...we are not saying...if you want to make the decision to put the ladders back into service and down the road you still comply with the 98% after the tax rate is set, that is fine. That is the way I understand it. Is that correct, Kevin?

Mr. Clougherty responded that is right and hopefully the 98% turns out to be a better number and provides even more flexibility.

Alderman DeVries stated I will expand on that line of questioning. Chief Kane, the majority of your overtime needs come in the summer when you have a higher number of individuals on vacation is that correct?

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Alderman DeVries asked so your opportunity to save in your overtime budget has already gone by. That would be the summer months, well through the end of September.

Chief Kane answered correct through the end of September. For the majority the big bite, there are additional spots during the years, specifically when the kids are out on vacation.

Alderman DeVries stated so for you to say that you are going to put the ladder trucks back in service and then at some future point in time have an opportunity to come back in compliance with the 98% spending cap really is not a fair statement as it is applicable to your department because there are only certain points in the year that you can make a savings without putting even additional companies out of service. Is that correct?

Chief Kane responded that is correct. For the most part, it has been about 1/3 of my overtime budget this summer, which is already gone. So for me...I really want to be able to put those ladders back in service unless something happens. Now, the other thing I heard Kevin say is that maybe when they go to set the tax rate they may be requesting the departments to do a 99% as opposed to a 98%. Well what that would do to me would enable me to put a ladder truck back in service at that point in time if the Board gave us that directive.

Alderman DeVries stated just to expand on it a little bit further so that my fellow members understand where you have already seen your major timeframe that you could have made your savings that means as the vacation is lessened you have extra personnel that you are looking to reallocate back on to the ladder truck as opposed to leaving them floating on to other engines.

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Alderman DeVries stated so all we are saying is that it is possible that you will come in at 99% and not 98% to be putting the ladder trucks, one or two of them,

back in service and have the discussion with us further but it is quite likely since you have already tried to make as much savings as you are going to see in the year, that 99% is as good as you can do without taking extra measures.

Chief Kane responded you went a little deep on that one but I think if I could spit that back at you and say right now we do have some other people and probably near the end of the month we will be looking at that to see if we can utilize some of those people and get them off of a floater thing and on to a permanent thing and get some people back in but staying at the 98% at this point in time the way I look at it in the budget we would have to keep those trucks out of service but as Kevin said there may be some opportunity to go to 99% and then I know I can say that I can get a truck back in service at that point in time. Just one final thing, you talked about the cycle schedule. That ends the first week of November. As you know, that all plays in to how we allocate our resources and our people.

Mr. Clougherty stated I was just going to add that it is September 21 now. We are really talking about a month of expenditures that people have to make some decisions about whether that is providing the Verizon service or the vehicles for the Fire Department. Those are decisions you have to make one month's spending worth that is going to get you to November and that is when we are going to have the tax rate set so it is not a long timeframe and a lot of money that we should be talking about. It is not the whole year. We are going to have to revisit this issue in another 30 to 45 days. What the Chief is saying is maybe we should table the request until the tax rate is set and then we can revisit it at that point. Certainly in the next month we can see if we can make some decisions that may not be that difficult. If we come back next month people can maybe make some decisions that may not be that difficult. For example if we come back after we set the tax rate and say everything goes against us and we have to go back and say to the departments you have to live with the 98%, well at that point in time some decisions are going to have to be made. On the other hand, if things go our way and we can provide a bit more relief than at that point people can make their decisions for the balance of the year. At that point they are looking at the period from November through the end of July. We are only really talking about trying to adjust this for one month.

Chairman Sysyn asked Kevin don't we need coverage at the Verizon before that.

Mr. Clougherty answered even with that, Madame Chairman, you can say to them cover it for a month. I mean what is the cost going to be for one month and then at the end even if we have our worst results for the tax rate setting we can go back and say okay we understand you expended X number of dollars for that month and a half for that service and this is what we will transfer in to cover that. You are really looking for just a month worth of time here so you can get a good final

decision on where you are for the balance of the fiscal year and then you set that policy and everybody is ready going forward from that point.

Alderman Guinta asked, Chief, if we change the policy to allow your men to take single day vacations what would that savings add up to. Has someone in your department done that calculation or has Kevin done it?

Chief Kane answered there is a great debate in regards to that but I have never heard anyone say there was going to be a savings there. I heard that it won't cost anything and I heard that it would cost a lot of money but I never heard anyone say that there would be a savings.

Alderman Guinta asked well doesn't it impact the amount of overtime that is required.

Chief Kane answered correct. If someone has a one-day vacation then the amount of overtime would increase.

Alderman Guinta asked increase or decrease.

Chief Kane answered increase.

Alderman Guinta asked why would it increase.

Chief Kane answered well if you go out on vacation and you take a one day vacation I am going to need to replace you with another person and I am going to have to hire a person at time and a half to replace you.

Alderman Guinta asked if somebody takes a week vacation...right now the men can only take vacations at certain times during the week correct.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Guinta asked so if someone is allowed to take a single day vacation in September, October, November and they take three, four or five of those doesn't that reduce the amount of time they are going to be taking in the summer, therefore, you are not going to have to appropriate as much of the overtime because you can use some of the extra guys that you have throughout the year?

Chief Kane responded some engine companies take vacation year round. We don't just take vacations during the summer time. The summer time vacations are picked by seniority. There are basically 10 weeks in the summer time and that is like five people. Down at a company those five people are going to pick the

summer vacation and there are still 15 other people that need to pick vacations so they pick vacations year round. I think what you are saying is that...

Alderman Guinta interjected I am saying let's use the floaters throughout the entire year rather than everybody taking vacation on a weekly basis and let's see if that process can save us 1% or 2% and then we don't have to deal with this anymore. We can do it on a limited basis even. We don't have to agree for the next three years. We can do it on a one-year or six-month basis and see if that works. We may not have to have this discussion.

Chief Kane replied we do use the floaters year round. We use them every single week. They are assigned on a weekly basis.

Alderman Guinta stated right now you have a truck that is out and floaters that aren't being used so let's put the truck back in use and have the floaters plug in on dailies instead of two or three weeks at a time in the summer. Why can't we just try that?

Chief Kane responded we do that. We do that now.

Alderman Guinta stated the problem is that people aren't taking vacations because the vacation policy is not flexible enough. You can't do that right now.

Chief Kane asked so you are saying if we allowed everyone to take one day's vacation we would be able to reduce our budget.

Alderman Guinta replied I am asking you that.

Chief Kane stated my read on it in talking to...not only my read by the financial people's read is I didn't see anyone come back and say we could save money that way. Certainly if we could save money that way we would certainly be doing it. I don't understand why we wouldn't be doing it.

Alderman Guinta asked if we tabled this could we have someone in your office, Kevin, look at it and see if there is a savings.

Mr. Clougherty answered sure. I would be happy to look at that.

Alderman O'Neil stated Chief I kind of want to pick up where both Alderman Guinta and Alderman DeVries were. You are over the curve now of the big vacation time. It is 10 weeks from July first through the middle of September.

Chief Kane responded yes but we look to the end of September.

Alderman O'Neil stated I still have to believe at this point now that we are over this curve there has to be people, maybe not every shift, but there has to be enough people to put those trucks back into service without it costing you overtime.

Chief Kane responded that is something that we are going to be looking at.

Alderman O'Neil stated looking at can mean an indefinite period of time. I would like to get these trucks back into service as soon as possible. I certainly understand that you need to continue in the direction you have been going for the past 10 or 11 weeks but I still believe now that we are over that curve there has to be periods of time when you can put those trucks back into service without it costing the City overtime. The only thing I can ask and I don't know if a motion is necessary but I think the Board would be very interested in seeing that. It is going to be some work. You are going to have to manage almost shift by shift but you have done that before. That is not uncommon.

Chief Kane stated absolutely. We don't have any problem doing it shift by shift. It is difficult to say that you are going to have that staff until 8 AM so you are saying that at 8 AM you want us to shift those people around to the truck or...basically you could maybe assign them to the truck and then ship them out for the day at 8 AM.

Alderman O'Neil replied all I am saying is I know you have done it in the past under different circumstances but we have gotten through it okay. We are hoping this isn't prolonged and I am optimistic as the Finance Officer is that we are going to get some good news come the end of October or beginning of November and Alderman Smith reminds me that you have another challenge ahead of you with what are you going to do with the personnel from Station 2 when construction starts there. So there may or may not be savings opportunities with that. Just as an Alderman I don't think a motion is needed but I would encourage you to take a look at it. If there is a shift you can put them back in service I suggest you do it.

Chief Kane responded certainly we will do that, Alderman.

Alderman O'Neil asked are we looking to table this.

Chairman Sysyn stated we could table this and have them look at what can be done.

Alderman O'Neil moved to table the request from the Fire Department and have the Fire Chief look at putting the trucks in service if possible. Alderman Forest

duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Police Chief Jaskolka seeking exemption from the 2% budget reduction for the Police Department in order to meet needs for details outside of the Verizon Wireless Arena or consideration of other methods of funding for this purpose.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we have had discussion on this. I think it is a public safety issue. Alderman Smith is pointing out that Mayor Baines reinstituted the detail from a note that he has but I would encourage that we do the detail. We are only talking about a month. As Kevin said if for some reason things don't go our way the Chief is going to have to let us know what the cost is and we will have to figure out other methods to pay for it. Is that what you said, Kevin?

Mr. Clougherty responded that is right Alderman. I think in fairness to the Chief you document what those costs are so that once the tax rate is set if there needs to be some type of an adjustment he is not hurt by that.

Police Chief John Jaskolka stated as part of the request for the 98% I made several changes going into the summer months, which of course like the Fire Department I have used vacation times. I looked into the officers that I didn't have that are on active duty. I looked at two positions that were vacant and I also looked at the Verizon overtime detail, which last year cost the department \$94,220. I fully expect that to go up over \$100,000 this year with the recent raises. After I did that, looking at what I just mentioned, the people on leave and so forth I still came up about \$70,000 short of the \$403,000 that I needed to come up with. So what I did to eliminate as much as possible overtime in the patrol division is I made 14 transfers from specialized divisions, seven of which were the School Resource Officers who went into patrol for the summer. Normally four go into patrol and three go into Juvenile to cover for vacations there and then I transferred one person from each division – Detectives, Juvenile, Chief Fire Arms Instructor, Traffic Enforcement, Investigations – three D.A.R.E. officers and two Community Police Officers to patrol. For the most part that worked out and we used very limited overtime for the summer months. After that was done there were three events at the Verizon and the Verizon was kind enough to provide videotape showing the problems with hundreds of people trying to cross the street against the "Don't Walk" light and people trying to drive through the traffic in order to make the green lights. It was just a mess down there, which was obviously a public safety problem. So we reinstituted our detail. As a result of reinstituting the detail, the estimated \$100,000, I have also not hired two other positions so with

the 2% cut it was two officers and with the Verizon detail going back in that is two more officers so that is four positions I am not hiring along with the three who are on active military duty right now. The School Resource Officers are back in the schools. The Chief Fire Arms Instructor is back at her position to continue fire arms training and one person was also put back into Crime Prevention in order to handle the grammar school issues leaving some people still in patrol. The problem I guess is the Verizon detail, which according to the contract was negotiated back in November 2001. We are responsible from the curbside out. In order to reduce the budget somewhat we have reduced the positions from the initial detail. Right now there are only three people down there. There have been constant requests to put the fourth one back at Lake Avenue and Chestnut Street.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think the Chief painted a good picture of where he laid this out but I guess I am...where are you. What do you think in the next month the Verizon detail will cost you? I am guessing they are going to start gearing up with events.

Chief Jaskolka responded October I believe starts hockey. That is when it is really going to start getting busy. I don't have an exact cost because I don't have the list of games yet but figuring it is a 10-month period and close to \$100,000 probably \$10,000 a month.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to say that I agree with the statement that the Finance Officer made earlier. I would like to see these positions filled. The Chief brought up a very good point as I have spoken to him about Lake Avenue and Chestnut Street. It is not the prime spot for people to enter the arena but I saw somebody almost get hit by a bus last year there without a police officer there. I was hoping it was something they could look at but I am willing to not leave the department hanging and if things don't work out then we have to find another source of funding for it.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked may I clarify what the motion might be.

Alderman O'Neil stated the motion would be to reinstate the details at the Verizon...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected and not transfer the funds at this time pending setting of the tax rate but also authorizing him to continue.

Alderman O'Neil responded correct and I want to make it clear in my motion that we are not going to leave the department hanging if things don't work out.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated so it is with the intent that some funding source be found if needed in the future.

Alderman O'Neil replied correct.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Ron Carvell, Security Manager of the Verizon Wireless Arena, requesting various street closures and redirection of Spruce and Cedar Streets in order to accommodate a safe operating area for equipment and animals of the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus from October 17th through October 25th.

Alderman Smith moved to approve the request. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a comment and I think I spoke to Mr. Bechert about this. It was brought to my attention and I can't for the life of me think of the Manchester Housing facility that is closest to the arena...one is the O'Malley and one is the Kalivas but a resident approached me that there was some concern because they don't have enough on-site parking for the residents and a lot of them have visiting nurses and that kind of stuff and there was no parking available. I know that Tim said he was going to work with the Police Department. It is not in here but I hope we can make those provisions for those people. Do you want Mr. Bechert to come up? Other than that, I have no problem with it but that was pointed out that the people supporting the people at the high rises didn't have a place to park.

Tim Bechert stated that issue has been addressed. To my left is our Security Manager, Ron Carvell, who has daily contact with the Police Department, as well as Fire and Alderman O'Neil to answer specifically your concern or the concern that was brought to your attention the closure of Chestnut, the entire street, and correct me if I am wrong Ron but it is only for a few hours during the physical load in of the circus and then the exodus of the circus. At no time consistently is Chestnut Street blocked. We are also working with the Police Department and Traffic to make sure that there are certain spots designated for emergency personnel like visiting doctors and nurses who take care of the folks that reside there.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated Alderman Forest had two items that he wanted to address now because there are two people in the audience that are on time constraints.

Alderman Forest stated as a professional courtesy I would like to remove Item 15 from the table.

Communication from Alderman Forest requesting no through trucking and prohibiting commercial motor vehicular and truck traffic on Goffstown Road from Straw Road to the Goffstown line.

(Tabled 08/10/2004 pending further discussion with City, Goffstown, developer and Alderman Forest.)

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to remove Item 15 from the table.

Alderman Forest stated Bob Wheeler from Goffstown is here and I know at the last meeting I was asking that Goffstown Road have trucking cut off from Straw Road to the Goffstown line. Since then I have met with Bob Wheeler who is representing Goffstown. I know that Alderman O'Neil had suggested a compromise that we lower the timeframe of the restrictions that are already in place on Goffstown Road. Again, I spoke with Bob Wheeler. Bob Wheeler has agreed to this and I just want to make a motion that we change the hours from what it is now, which is 9:30 PM until 7 AM to 8:30 PM until 7 AM. It might not make all of my constituents happy but it's...we can't shut off the road all together. I know that Pam Goucher was going to be here tonight to explain that her and Kevin Sheppard have been working with the Goffstown Planning Board to keep Manchester posted on their project and I guess they have been doing that but Pam's father-in-law passed away yesterday so she couldn't make it tonight. This compromise has been reached.

Alderman Forest moved to amend the no through trucking ordinance on Goffstown Road from Straw Road to the Goffstown line to 8:30 PM-7 AM.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Forest moved to remove Item 17 from the table. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Communication from Richard J. Mulvee of the Tower Realty Group requesting that two of the nine parking spaces on Elm Street in front of the Hampshire Plaza be designated as Handicap Only with a 30-minute limit.

Alderman Forest stated since our last meeting I have made a few phone calls and I have had the City Clerk make a few phone calls about the handicap parking that Tower Realty has requested. Originally, someone at the state said that we had to limit it to three hours. I read a copy of the state law, which says that the municipality can change the hours and everything else and I did ask the City Solicitor to check on the ruling. I believe Solicitor Arnold has a comment on what I requested as far as doing this.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated the state statute to which Alderman Forest is referring basically says that the City can control the time period for handicapped parking in accordance with guidelines from the Governor's Commission on Disability. What those guidelines say is that at minimum the amount of time on the handicapped parking has to equal the parking allowance at the regular meters. In other words if you have two-hour meters than the handicap parking at minimum can have a two-hour limit on it. What the Governor's Council usually suggests is that you take the limit on parking and add an hour to it for handicap parking but as I said the requirement is that at minimum it has to be equal to the time limit on the parking meters in the area.

Chairman Sysyn asked so what you are recommending is that we can lower the time at those meters.

Alderman Forest stated right now I believe the meters are two hours for that block. From what I understand what we would probably have to do is change all of those meters to one hour and then put in the two handicap zones for one hour and we can do that.

Chairman Sysyn stated now we need curb cuts also don't we.

Alderman Forest responded I believe there are curb cuts on either end but I guess Tom can explain it.

Mr. Tom Lolicata stated depending on where they want these, federal guidelines say you need a curb cut for these people so I am going to say probably closest to the signals where the crosswalks are. There is quite a distance and no parking in between there before the meters start. There is a traffic box there and a few other obstacles but I believe that is where the crosswalks are and the only place they can do it without a regular curb cut.

Alderman Forest stated there are curb cuts where the crosswalks are right now correct.

Mr. Lolicata responded you can't put a car there. You can't park them there. That is right in line with the signals. In other words you have to utilize your meters like you said.

Alderman Forest asked how about at the north end of the building right near Spring Street. There are no boxes there or anything.

Mr. Lolicata stated there are two or three meters from Spring Street down toward the lights correct. How many spots are you looking for? Two?

Alderman Forest responded we are looking for two but what I understand from Mr. Arnold's ruling is that we have to make that whole block of meters one-hour from Mechanic to Spring and then make the two one-hour handicap zones at the north end. We have to change the meters. We can't just put a one-hour handicap zone and leave the meters at two hours.

Chairman Sysyn asked can't we just do it from Spring Street to where the traffic light is or do we have to do it for the whole block.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded I guess there is no clear answer to that. My point being that since the handicap spaces at minimum have to equal the time limit on the meters you can alter the zone but I think that the courts or anybody else will probably look askant at the City making two handicap parking spots a parking zone so my recommendation was they should probably do it all along that block but that is the basis.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is just from roughly Mechanic Street to the signals or roughly the middle of the block of 1000 Elm Street there are four spaces and then from there north to Spring Street there are five spaces.

Chairman Sysyn responded yes and I am talking about from that traffic light to Spring Street.

Alderman O'Neil asked so are we talking about taking two of the five spaces and making them handicap spaces. If we did that I don't understand what the problems are then. Tom if we take from roughly opposite Concord Street north to Spring there are approximately five spaces and if we made two of those handicap what does that do to the whole...

Deputy Solicitor Arnold interjected the handicap spaces would have to have...

Alderman O'Neil interjected I was talking to Tom Lolicata but finish your answer.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated all I was going to do is repeat what I have said which is that those handicap parking meters would have to at minimum have the same amount of time as the rest of the meters in that zone.

Chairman Sysyn stated you would have to change it to one-hour parking.

Alderman Smith stated I have handicapped plates. I can park anyplace in the City of Manchester, am I correct, with no charge at any meter.

Lt. Valenti responded yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we have Lt. Valenti come up please.

Mr. Lolicata stated you have to realize that you are talking about lowering it.

Alderman O'Neil responded hold on. I am confused enough as it is on this.

Mr. Lolicata replied I will make it very simple. You shouldn't keep lowering it when you are thinking about handicap. They are looking for a real minimum and that is why we have three hours.

Alderman O'Neil stated so according to Alderman Smith if someone has a handicapped plate they can pull up to any parking spot and they don't have to feed the meter. Would that be true of a placard that they have on their mirror as well?

Lt. Valenti answered correct.

Chairman Sysyn stated I believe the reason they want a lesser time is because people are doing errands for the Federal building now and they are only there for a short time. They are not there for two or three hours.

Alderman Forest stated yes I think that is what it is. They are requesting a lower time for people that are coming in like to the IRS to pick up forms and the post office to check their mailboxes.

Chairman Sysyn stated that is why I suggested from the Concord Street crosswalk to Spring Street because that is the building that you are talking about. That would be their entrance and exit.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess a question would be if we do it for this building are we then going to get requests for every building in downtown Manchester.

Chairman Sysyn responded I don't think so because they can park anywhere.

Alderman O'Neil asked then why do we need to do anything then.

Chairman Sysyn responded because they don't want them to take up three hours. They only want it for ½ hour to an hour. It doesn't take them that long to run into the building and out.

Mr. Lolicata asked would a no parking/loading zone answer the question. We could allow 30 minutes for a loading zone.

Chairman Sysyn replied you have no loading zones on Elm Street.

Mr. Lolicata stated but you are looking for two handicap spaces so would two no parking/loading zones answer that question.

Alderman O'Neil asked has the Alderman whose ward this is in been consulted on this at all. It appears that he hasn't.

Alderman Guinta responded other than the last meeting no. I was at the last meeting and that is the first I heard of it.

Alderman O'Neil asked so the staff hasn't reached out to you or the owners haven't reached out to you.

Alderman Guinta answered no.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to say that I agree with Alderman Smith but I think Mr. Lolicata brought up a good point. Even though it is not on Elm Street maybe the side street could be a loading zone just as a suggestion.

Chairman Sysyn asked are you talking about having one on Spring Street. Where would you put the loading zone?

Mr. Lolicata stated I was saying it could be put on Elm Street. All I am saying is it would take the place of this "handicap space."

Chairman Sysyn stated but if you do a loading zone on Elm Street you are going to have a lot of other people asking for loading zones on Elm Street. One that I know of would be Eliza's.

Mr. Lolicata responded there are some on Elm Street now.

Chairman Sysyn asked so you would do a loading zone then right at the corner, probably around Spring Street or on the side street.

Mr. Lolicata answered if the intent was for handicapped people I would bring it as close as possible for them. If it isn't I can put it anywhere.

Alderman Smith stated I would be embarrassed if somebody came down with disabled plates and parked for over 30 minutes. A lot of them have access vans with wheelchairs and things like that. It seems like we are creating two spaces for this private company. That is all I have to say.

Alderman Forest stated well actually it is for the post office and the IRS. They are the ones who requested it because they have handicapped people who come in again to pick up their mail and to go to the IRS to pick up forms. That was the purpose. It was for handicapped people, not for the average John Q. Public to go in and park there like they do in other loading zones for ½ hour or 40 minutes and go somewhere else.

Mr. Lolicata asked in the garage aren't there handicapped spots right near the ramp to go straight into the post office. They must have some nearby there.

Alderman Forest stated Mr. Nardi is here from the Plaza. There are handicapped spots in the garage that are rented to people who work in the building so they are not always available. It is a private garage.

Chairman Sysyn stated it is a private garage so the handicapped parking is not free in that garage. It is used by people who work there. I talked to Mr. Mulvee on that and asked him why they were charging and he said it is because it is for people who work in the building and it is a private garage.

Alderman Forest stated they don't come under that state law for free parking.

Alderman Guinta stated I hate to make this any longer but can someone from Tower Realty come up. Can you clarify what the need is?

Mr. Nardi stated we have as you know the facility on Elm Street and there are no handicapped parking spaces available on Elm Street to service the post office, the new tenants the IRS, HUD and we have a credit union also. What we are looking for is a couple of handicapped parking spaces to service the entire block.

Alderman Smith says he has a handicapped sticker but an identified handicapped

parking space is more readily available to that sticker than a meter. We do have a lot of people who come to the building who are handicapped and want access to the post office and the IRS.

Alderman Guinta asked have you seen an increased need since some of the new federal tenants have come in.

Mr. Nardi responded absolutely.

Alderman Guinta asked so this is the driving factor. Is it fair to say that the driving factor here is the new tenants?

Mr. Nardi answered absolutely the new tenants and also it has been a concern of the post office in the past but they have had that free handicapped parking in the back garage that is no longer available.

Alderman O'Neil asked why isn't the free handicapped parking available in the garage.

Mr. Nardi answered because it is a private garage and we rent it out to tenants.

Alderman O'Neil asked that is an easy decision for you to make then isn't it.

Mr. Nardi answered well we paid a lot for the garage and we are trying to recoup our investment. Also it doesn't service the front of the building, the IRS and the post office.

Alderman O'Neil stated the post office has been there for some time and I haven't heard a request since prior to you owning the building and the other tenants like Public Service people went there to pay their bills and I have to be honest it seems like you are looking for the City to do something you guys should be doing. That is how I interpret this.

Mr. Nardi asked we can't mark Elm Street can we.

Alderman O'Neil answered no but there was free handicapped parking in the garage before you guys bought the garage.

Mr. Nardi responded I understand but we shouldn't be penalized for buying the garage and trying to make a profit. It is a private garage and the handicapped spaces in there don't really service the needs in the front of the building. We are asking the City to provide handicapped parking. It doesn't seem that unreasonable. That is all we are asking to do.

Chairman Sysyn stated they have handicapped parking across from the Plaza near Dunkin Donuts.

Alderman Forest asked how long have the federal offices been in the Plaza.

Mr. Nardi answered a few months.

Alderman Forest stated and previously those offices were vacant, correct.

Mr. Nardi responded absolutely. Now we are about 60% occupied. There are a number of agencies. We are not here to ram something down the City's throat. If you want to do it, fine. If you don't, so be it.

Alderman Guinta stated I am okay with it. If it presents...I understand the concern about setting a precedent. I think the clear position here is that due to the increased federal office activity downtown I think we can make this accommodation. Personally I am okay with it.

Alderman DeVries stated not to take any longer with this but I was just going to ask the Committee to consider the difficulty of handicapped individuals, wheelchair bound, trying to get into that building. Mechanic Street is often...those metered parking spaces are taken because of the YMCA so Spring Street is the only opportunity and I know that I have at many times needed to go into that facility and have circled that particular block many times before I found a parking spaces. I don't think it is an unreasonable request. They cannot travel the several blocks that an able bodied individual such as myself could to park.

Alderman Forest moved to make two handicapped parking spots at the north end towards Spring Street. Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked are we doing the one-hour limit for those five meters.

Alderman Forest answered yes.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked Mr. Lolicata are you able to get these for the committee report. Do you understand what they are looking for and can you get that information to the Clerk's Office?

Mr. Lolicata answered yes.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Smith and O'Neil voting in opposition and Chairman Sysyn breaking the tie.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Usage of seatbelts by city employees.

Mr. Harry Ntapalis stated I did receive early on from this particular Committee a request to look at the seatbelt policy that has been in effect since 1986 with the City of Manchester. It was actually passed as a result of us going self-insured with auto and also our general liability needs back in the late 80's. We tried with that draft to capture what you folks may have wanted to do in a way of making this particular seatbelt policy broader in nature. I am not certain if there is something else that the Committee is actually looking for here.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't recall how this whole thing got started but I guess the basic question is do we require employees to use seatbelts.

Mr. Ntapalis responded when they are using City vehicles the employee and/or their occupants are required to use them.

Alderman O'Neil replied this ordinance isn't very clear then because you need to really go looking for it. It should say plain and simple if you use a City vehicle you wear a seatbelt. This looks like it is almost covering the City in cases of vehicle accidents, which I understand. I am not advocating one way or the other but if we want to have a stringent seatbelt policy I think it has to clearly say that and I don't read that in this draft to be honest with you.

Mr. Ntapalis responded again when this particular ordinance was put into effect in the mid-80's not all of our vehicles were totally equipped. Some of the trucks and some of the heavier equipment did not have seat restraint mechanisms. To the extent of those that did it was advocated that they must wear them. If they don't and it results in an accident and your point is well taken, Alderman, that at that point after the fact then there was an issue in looking into the accident. A straight out policy now that all occupants wear them, we can draft something like that if that is what the Committee wants.

Alderman O'Neil stated that is not what this says, correct.

Mr. Ntapalis responded no it is more or less the need that the City of Manchester has to maintain the seatbelts in good operating condition and to the extent that you do have them, wear them but only after an accident should take place that is the time that you are called to task on it. Now we thought with the draft and we added

another paragraph in there that it did address your concern but if it still doesn't you may want to eliminate something here. I don't know.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am not trying to create something that your department will have to solely enforce. I think any policies that we pass regarding safety should be Citywide. I know that you folks have worked hard for instance with fall protection for people working in buckets and things like that and it is hard for you or for Kevin to be everywhere when those activities are going on. I certainly don't want to create something that is unenforceable and the intent isn't to create something that your department would be solely responsible for. I think it has to be the responsibility of all City agencies to enforce with their employees. I honestly cannot remember how this thing came before us.

Alderman Smith stated I can. I got a call from Alderman Guinta's constituent. There was almost an accident with City employees in a truck and the individual witnessed it and they went up to the windshield and he did call me and Alderman Guinta and that was the explanation. He said he was a constituent and the truck almost got in an accident and he could see the guy didn't have a seatbelt on. My contention when this was brought up is I know we have garbage collectors and those guys who ride in the back don't have a seatbelt. That is common sense. So there have to be some exceptions.

Alderman Guinta stated I think the intent is someone sitting inside the cab of a vehicle where seatbelts are accessible should use seatbelts. I don't think the intention is to make an individual on the back of a garbage truck wear a seatbelt. The intent here is...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected perhaps the City Solicitor could address it.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I would note on the policy marked draft in your agendas the second paragraph down says "seatbelts must be in good operating condition and periodically inspected, maintained and used by all occupants riding inside City motor vehicle."

Mr. Ntapalis stated if that is not clear enough we can take it back to the drawing board but we thought we captured the essence of what you wanted with that passage.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated what you need to be looking at is the one marked draft, not the 1986 copy of the policy.

Alderman Guinta stated we don't have the one marked draft.

Alderman O'Neil asked can Deputy Solicitor Arnold state his position again.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded I was just pointing out what the policy that is being suggested this afternoon says is that seatbelts must be in good operating condition and periodically inspected, maintained and used by all occupants riding inside City motor vehicles.

Mr. Ntapalis stated we thought that was broad enough without really dropping everything that was already in place. I don't know how much more broader you would want it.

Alderman Smith stated what gets me is the last statement. It says, "shall be explained why seatbelts weren't used." Well I think if the paragraph before says it should be used by all occupants I think there has to be some directive from the department instead of just saying why they weren't used. There has to be something done to that individual for not using the seatbelt. Every state has a seatbelt law except this state and if you are dealing in construction safety is the most important issue and I think that it is common sense to have your seatbelt on.

Mr. Ntapalis responded I would agree with you, Alderman. If I may there is no teeth in this particular ordinance. In other words it doesn't go so far as to say what the repercussions might be if you don't. Generally that is regulated by the department head. Once their employee has been involved in an accident we do inform them through our loss history that they have had accidents and the department generally deals with the matter.

Alderman O'Neil stated my thought is if we are going to have a policy it has to be uniform throughout the City. It can't be in Department A it is enforced and in Department B it is slightly enforced and in Department C it is not enforced. I think if we are going to have a policy like this it has to be enforced Citywide. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. Ntapalis responded that might be something for consideration. Of course our department doesn't have the enforcement authority to discipline employees that may not comply. We don't have that authority at this juncture.

Alderman Guinta asked are you telling me if an employee in the City disobeys and ordinance a department head doesn't have any mechanism...

Mr. Ntapalis interjected no I am not saying that whatsoever. It doesn't rest with Risk Management. It rests with that department head and/or supervisor. That is where the authority to discipline the employee rests. Not with the Safety Officer or the Risk Manager.

Alderman O'Neil stated that actually has been a little bit of an issue with the fall protection correct. I know you guys have worked on it but you really don't have the authority. You can only inform the department and have faith that the department is going to address the issue.

Mr. Ntapalis responded and we do that on a quarterly basis, Alderman, through loss history reports. In the past three years, for example we have about \$127,000 in the area of automobile related incidences. Of those, 75% are subrogation cases, which means we weren't at fault in the accident and we are receiving monies back from the party that hit our car or our truck. Again, that doesn't lighten the fact that seatbelts should be a must. Seatbelts in my opinion should also be worn by employees who are on assignment using their own vehicles because the City of Manchester still pays the worker's compensation claims if indeed there is an accident so that does impact that. If we really wanted to make it even broader we could do that as well.

Alderman Forest asked could we just refer it back to you and maybe you could work with the Solicitor on another draft.

Mr. Ntapalis asked do you want to incorporate very broad language that if a City employee is on official business whether they are using a City vehicle and/or their own in order to prevent injury or accident they should be compelled to wear a seatbelt at all times.

Alderman Forest stated well you are saying that we are paying worker's compensation if they get involved in an accident so I would say yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated if there is some way to give it some teeth and I don't know what that is but I know the private sector would have items such as whether it is a seatbelt violation or some other violation the first day you are sent home with no pay and the second day you are suspended a day, etc. Three strikes and you are out. I don't know that we should go that far but that is no uncommon in the private sector. The post office probably has something like that.

Alderman Forest stated I know that we need some exceptions to this. I don't know if we want to put in writing that there are exceptions to this in certain cases both in Fire and Police where at times they cannot because of safety issues wear them. If they are chasing somebody and they are trying to run out of their car or is somebody rear ends them and they are halfway in and halfway out of their car. There has to be some exceptions to allow for safety issues.

Mr. Ntapalis stated so you want some latitude built into the policy.

Alderman Forest responded yes depending on the type of work the person does.

Alderman Lopez stated since it is already on the books as Tom Arnold said I think Harry has indicated that it is up to the department heads to enforce the policy so if the Committee would instruct the City Clerk to send a memo out from the Committee bringing this item to their attention that they should wear a seatbelt I think that would suffice.

Chairman Sysyn stated they already did that.

Alderman O'Neil stated with all due respect to Alderman Lopez I found when you leave it up to departments...we have safety issues. Some departments if an employee is using a chainsaw they need to wear the helmet, the eye protection, the hearing protection, the full chaps and other departments have no policy at all for an employee to wear anything using a chainsaw. I have to respectfully disagree that we leave this up to departments. I think it has to be a Citywide policy for all departments. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. Ntapalis stated we could offer some suggestions as to how to make it uniform and application. We would be glad to do something along those lines. The other thing I could offer to you periodically, particularly in more recent months, we have sent out via e-mail and hard copy to all of the departments notification that in order to event the type of injuries that could result in an accident without seat restraint that they do make sure that their employees if they are assigned a City vehicle are wearing it at all times. So we do send out those reminders. Again, have we suggested what course of action be taken if they don't? We have not gone that far.

Alderman Forest moved to refer this item back to Harry Ntapalis to work with the Solicitor and come up with a policy with some teeth in it for seatbelt use.

Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Report from the Public Health Director re: signage at the Rines Center.

Chairman Sysyn called Fred Rusczek, Health Director and Grace Freije from the Arts Commission forward. Georgie Reagan sent us a parking plan that has been distributed.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I read Mr. Rusczek's letter, what he is pretty much telling us is that no one currently using the facility had dedicated parking.

Mr. Rusczek responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked that would be the three City agencies.

Mr. Rusczek answered correct the three City agencies and volunteers that would work for the Health Department. There are no dedicated parking spots.

Alderman O'Neil asked so it is first come first served. So the Directors could be theoretically out in the very last spots.

Mr. Rusczek answered absolutely. Sometimes we can't get a spot right around the building. It is pretty rare but it does happen.

Chairman Sysyn asked so is your recommendation not to allow this.

Mr. Rusczek answered my recommendation and this is also in concurrence with the Director of the Welfare Department, Paul Martineau and the Director of the Office of Youth Services Program that we continue to maintain the parking as open for all. In here I say that the art gallery is open primarily at night. The Manchester Art Association is operating the gallery from 10AM until 4 PM Wednesday through Saturday and the gallery allows the people who display their works there to sell their works and in return they volunteer to work there. I would hope that we are able to maintain all of the spaces around there for the public, employees and others on a first come first served basis.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Fred, the staff that works at the facility now are they guaranteed parking on site.

Mr. Rusczek answered no none of our staff are guaranteed parking on site. Now obviously if they show up to work before the public starts coming in there are spots. It is a rare occasion when parking becomes a problem around there and that is when the conference centers get used. From my perspective having been at 795 Elm Street where we used to walk several blocks and the public used to work several blocks and compared to City Hall the parking is generally pretty good around there and if you have to walk it is only a couple of blocks across Elm Street or so to be able to find adequate parking.

Alderman O'Neil asked so someone coming for services at the Health Department or the Welfare Department or Youth Services if there is a space on site they can park on site.

Mr. Rusczek answered that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked so it is kind of open parking to anyone using the building whether it is City employees or the public and the same would be true for the Arts Commission.

Mr. Rusczek answered yes the same thing.

Ms. Grace Freije stated I am a member of the Arts Commission of the City of Manchester. Our request was based primarily on the fact that we for months and months were looking for someone to occupy that space in the McIninch Family Gallery. Finally we did. We are fortunate enough to have the Manchester Artists Association there and part of this request deals with the fact that often times they are carrying pieces of art work in and out and it is difficult to do that from areas that are two or three blocks away.

Alderman Forest stated I have a comment. I was there the other day to visit Fred and there were plenty of places around the building to park, whether it was the back alley or Elm Street or north or south. I can't see any problem with parking around there.

Chairman Sysyn asked Grace have you had any problems parking up there at all.

Ms. Freije answered I am not aware of any problems but unfortunately Georgie would probably be a better person to ask that question to.

Alderman O'Neil asked Grace and I have to apologize because I haven't been up there recently but the Arts Commission has space on what I would call the Elm Street floor is that correct.

Ms. Freije answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked so generally they would bring in the items in that door close to Brook and Elm.

Ms. Freije answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Fred, out front is there a space for a loading zone at all.

Mr. Rusczek answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked does that seem to be an issue Grace. If there is a loading zone out front and we are keeping the building consistent with the other people using it I guess I would hate to if we create and I said this to Mrs. Reagan last time that if we create dedicated spaces for the Arts Commission then we are going to be hearing from the three departments saying they want dedicated spaces as well.

Ms. Freije answered you could take your changes.

Alderman Forest stated if their door is on the Brook Street side, both sides of Brook Street are no parking and the bank drive-up exit exits on to Brook Street so putting two spots there for dedicated parking would interfere with the American Legion and the bank coming in and out of Brook Street.

Alderman Guinta asked why can't the loading zone be used.

Ms. Freije answered the loading zone can be used. That was part of the reason for the request but the other part was simply because we have volunteers that are in and out of there all the time and we just felt that offering them two parking spaces would...while it would make them happy they have requested that we ask for this as well. It was just something we could give back to the volunteers. That gallery is run with volunteers only.

Alderman Guinta stated I will tell you that I try to go down there as often as I can and drive around and I have to agree with Alderman Forest. I readily see spots available all around that building and I try to go at different days of the week at different times. So, I would like to try to help but I personally didn't see the need. Georgie mentioned this to me a few months ago and since that point I have tried to from time to time drive in that general area and I have never really seen...even on election day I was there throughout the day and there was space all throughout the day and that is going to be a day when you are going to have increased traffic on those streets and in the parking lot and even that day I found spots throughout the day. I would like to try to accommodate you and Commissioner Reagan but I really don't see a pressing need. I shouldn't say that. I didn't see a lack of availability.

Alderman Smith moved to accept the recommendation from Fred Ruscsek regarding signage at the Rines Center. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Kuei-Lin Chiang, owner of the Thousand Crane

Restaurant requesting to rent two spaces on Mechanic Street from 5 PM until 8 PM indicating "Take-Out Only Parking".

Alderman Guinta asked do we even have this in the City.

Chairman Sysyn stated they approached me and I told them if they were interested they should write a letter to Traffic and it is here. What would you like to do?

Alderman Forest asked isn't there a loading zone on Mechanic Street.

Chairman Sysyn answered no there is just 15 minute parking on Mechanic Street.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am pretty sure that on Vine Street we created some loading zones at the request of the businesses around that area. Am I correct on that? Both Tom Lolicata and Lt. Valenti are shaking their heads yes.

Chairman Sysyn stated so we can receive and file this and direct them to use...

Alderman Guinta interjected I don't think they can use anything on Vine. Is that what you were suggesting?

Alderman O'Neil stated yes the restaurants use them.

Alderman Guinta responded that is for deliveries I thought. This is for customers. They are asking for areas for customers to pick-up take out.

Alderman O'Neil replied I am sorry, you are correct.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to receive and file.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Ron Elias, owner of That Look located at 852 Elm Street requesting ten (10) spaces in the Middle Street Parking Lot be assigned to him so that he may provide valet parking to his clients.

Chairman Sysyn stated I think this goes back to when Mr. McQuade had the McQuades building. They all got together and paid for parking. There were a bunch of them that got together and they had a contract with us. Mr. Elias, would you like to come forward.

Mr. Ron Elias stated I would like to offer valet parking for the first time in Manchester where we would offer a service to the elderly and handicapped most of all. Also, I think it would enhance the downtown area having valet parking.

Alderman Forest stated I have a suggestion and I think I talked to Ron about this earlier this week. I think he is looking for valet parking where people would come up and you would park their cars for them. One suggestion I had with the exception of event nights at the arena but even that that parking lot isn't full we could allow Ron to use behind the federal building. It is not utilized anymore now that the federal offices are gone but taking the parking meters along City Hall here and everything else if we allow Mr. Elias to do it then we may have other people asking for it.

Chairman Sysyn responded he would be paying for these spaces.

Alderman Forest stated but we would be renting them to him for his use.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that lot is full from the Tax Collector and other departments at City Hall and for public hearings people use it at night. I am not sure what the hours are. From the Clerk's perspective since we are involved with running that parking lot there would be some concern.

Alderman Guinta asked what are the hours of your business.

Mr. Elias answered 8 AM until 8 PM Monday through Friday and 8 AM to 5 PM on Saturday.

Alderman Guinta asked so you are looking for 10 designated spots for six days a week.

Mr. Elias answered I would even start with less to have a few spots for valet parking. I have had a few people come to me now and ask me if we can valet their cars. We are not even open yet. We won't be open until Monday. Most of the people that have come to me are elderly.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated can I ask a question. Has there been any contact with Mr. Lolicata about perhaps renting a space in one of the parking garages or something because that to me would be a better thing. If you have a driver who is going to drive the car there anyway to me that would make more sense to use a space in a parking garage.

Mr. Elias responded I have talked to the Bank of New Hampshire and they told me they have a waiting list for a year.

Deputy City Clerk stated I am talking about the City parking garages. Have you approached the Traffic Department at all?

Mr. Elias answered no.

Chairman Sysyn stated no because I asked Tom about this and Tom suggested that he come to the Committee first.

Alderman Guinta asked, Tom, what is the closest lot to this location and are there spots available in that lot.

Mr. Lolicata answered as far as lots are concerned, they are filled. They are at full capacity now. The closest garage in his case is Victory. They are both the same. Victory or the Center of NH are probably the same distance apart.

Alderman Guinta asked and there is availability in both.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes if he is talking 10 cars or less there is availability.

Alderman Guinta stated I think you could probably do it without any City action then.

Mr. Lolicata responded he can rent the spaces and have a person down there if he wishes to bring the cars in and out. We could probably work something out.

Chairman Sysyn stated he probably wouldn't have to rent the spaces because if you drive a car into the garage and they are only there for an hour then you don't pay for parking...or two hours. If he used the Center of NH garage he wouldn't have to rent the spaces would he because he could just drive a car over there.

Mr. Lolicata responded he can't utilize the spaces without paying for them.

Chairman Sysyn stated right but when the valet driver comes out he has to pay for the ticket.

Mr. Lolicata responded he would be validated. In other words he would have a monthly lease like the other people. We would work something out where those spots are paid for and every time he enters and exits it would be validated. He would have to pay by the month like everybody else.

Chairman Sysyn asked like we do.

Mr. Lolicata answered exactly.

Chairman Sysyn stated that is \$65/month.

Mr. Lolicata answered that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked wouldn't it be cheaper for Mr. Elias if he just paid the hourly fee. That could be cheaper than paying \$65 for a space.

Chairman Sysyn responded that is what I was saying. If I drive into the garage and I don't have a parking permit that I paid for I pay by the hour.

Mr. Lolicata stated he can have a card to get in and out anytime he wants. When you go into the garage you have a card.

Chairman Sysyn replied right but when he goes to the garage and just pulls a ticket it would be cheaper for him wouldn't it.

Mr. Lolicata stated probably. That is his prerogative.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated he would have to estimate his clients and make a determination. That is a business decision.

Alderman O'Neil stated if Mr. Elias knew he was going to have 10 clients every hour from 8 AM until 8 PM the lease program makes sense but I don't know that he knows that and he would be paying for parking spaces that he may not be using.

Chairman Sysyn stated some people may park on the street. If I drove up and there is an empty space I am not going to need a valet to park my car so it would be cheaper for him to use...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected at least on an initial basis until he can make a business decision as to what makes sense for him. I think that is a business decision that he needs to make but he could certainly sit down and see what the costs are. I just feel that it is more...we already have the garages there and I guess I don't understand why we need to do this in a City lot that is probably one of the most utilized.

Chairman Sysyn stated well I think he wanted behind the McQuades building because it was closer for his valet parking.

Alderman Forest moved to table this item to have Tom Lolicata work something out with Mr. Elias and report back at the next meeting.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am not sure that we really need to be involved with this. We have a number of parking programs and Mr. Elias would have to work with Mr. Lolicata to figure out which program and which spots are appropriate. I don't know if it even needs to come back to us.

Chairman Sysyn responded then the motion could be just to send it to Tom Lolicata to work it out with...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected suggest that he contact Mr. Lolicata and work out his own arrangements.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to have Mr. Elias work with Mr. Lolicata to work something out.

Chairman Sysyn advised that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated there are a few items that are...

Chairman Sysyn interjected Alderman DeVries has some items that she wanted pulled off and I think Tom Lolicata has them.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can we just go through what we have officially and then we can add whatever else.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated the first item requested to be removed by Alderman DeVries is no parking during school hours on Circle Road from Weston Road to Manor Drive; on Circle Road from Weston Road to the start of a private way; on Circle Road from Manor Drive to Manor Drive and on Manor Drive from Circle Road to Circle Road. The second item to be removed would be under the rescind no parking on Circle Road from Weston Road to a point 100 feet easterly and on Circle Road from Weston Road to Manor Drive. There is a new item from Alderman Osborne.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we take care of Alderman DeVries' requests first.

Alderman DeVries stated before you take action what I would like the Committee to do for me...this is an area that is an apartment complex across from Memorial High School and we are having issues where the students have chosen to park on those streets during the day and it is creating a problem. Because it is mainly an

elderly rental complex we are trying to figure out how to accomplish removing the students during the day but at the same time allowing for the Caregivers, Meals on Wheels, etc. who come in to the area. I am working with the management company and I am hoping because we are looking at several programs – resident parking. It could be no parking during school hours or it could be a two-hour solution that we look at. I am hoping that this Committee will allow me to take care of whatever the appropriate action would be by emergency ordinance so that we don't have to wait for the next Committee meeting. It is likely that within the next week or two I will know which direction they wish to go in to properly take care of the concerns of the neighborhood. You can remove it from here as long as you understand that I would like to take care of this by emergency ordinance.

Alderman O'Neil asked what is the procedure for emergency ordinance.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the procedure normally would be...in this instance the idea is to delete these items from here. She can work with Tom and the Highway Director can certainly issue an emergency provision and then it will come to the Committee...

Alderman O'Neil interjected right the Director of Public Works has the power to...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected has the power to deal with it at any point.

Alderman O'Neil moved to delete the items as listed above from the traffic agenda. Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated I didn't mean to interrupt Matthew but he was going into another Alderman's request.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked do we just want to add another item on.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated Alderman Osborne would like to add no parking on Clough Avenue, east side, from Spruce Street to the dead end and we have one other new item. Do you want to deal with Alderman Osborne's item first?

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to approve the item.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated the final item of new business for the traffic agenda is from Frank Thomas requesting one hour parking from 8 AM until 8 PM on Kelley Street, south side, from Montgomery to Dubuque Street and rescinding one

hour parking (8 AM – 6 PM) signs on Kelley Street, south side, from Montgomery East Back Street to Dubuque Street.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to approve the items.

STOP SIGNS:

On Whittington Street @ Whittington Street, NWC
Alderman Gatsas

On Hall Street @ Pearl Street, NWC, SEC 4-Way
Alderman Sysyn

On So. Jewett Street @ Maurice Street, NWC, SEC 3-Way
On Charlotte Street @ Bernice Avenue, NEC, SWC
On Charlotte Street @ Brent Street, SWC, NEC
Alderman DeVries

NO PARKING:

On Blodget Street, south side, from Ash Street to a point 70 feet westerly
Alderman Gatsas

On Union Street, west side, from a point 135 feet south of Concord Street to
Amherst Street
Alderman Guinta

On Hospital Avenue, west side, from Massabesic Street to Chase Way
Alderman Osborne

On Colby Street, east side, from W. Hancock Street to the dead end
On S. Main Street, west side, from a point 80 feet south at A Street to C Street
Alderman Smith

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:

On Union Street, west side, from Concord Street to a point 45 feet south
Alderman Guinta

RESCIND NO PARKING:

On Union Street, west side, from Hanover Street to a point 50 feet north
Alderman Guinta

On Spruce Street, south side, from Cypress Street to Canton Street (Ord. 6540)

Alderman Osborne

On Colby Street, west side, from W. Hancock Street to the dead end (Ord. 2869)
Alderman Smith

RESCIND 1-HOUR PARKING:

On Union Street, west side, from Concord Street to a point 50 feet north of
Hanover Street (Ord. 6238)
Alderman Guinta

On So. Main Street, east side, from a point 160 feet north of Woodbury Street to a
point 100 feet south of Goffe Street (Ord. 6127)

PARKING 3 HOURS (MONDAY-FRIDAY):

On Union Street, west side, from a point 45 feet south of Concord Street to a point
90 feet south
Alderman Guinta

**NO VEHICLES – BUSES ONLY (7-9 AM, MONDAY-FRIDAY) – DURING
SCHOOL HOURS (EMERGENCY ACT):**

On Notre Dame Avenue at Walsh Avenue
Alderman Thibault

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to
approve the traffic agenda.

DISCUSSION: Relating to traffic situation at Harvey Road and Bouchard Street.

Alderman DeVries stated I am looking for some assistance from this Committee. This is an area that actually the problems with Harvey Road and this is south of the Airport runway so we are right up on the Londonderry line. I have the office park or Airport campus as Kevin Dillon puts it trying to exit out of Bouchard as well as the next road south, which is actually in Londonderry and they are having difficulty because of the speed of traffic as they come from Londonderry on Harvey Road. It is an area that doesn't have an immediately apparent cure. We probably need some assistance from Southern NH Planning or somebody to look at it where it is two municipalities that probably need to work together to decide if they are going to do signalization or some other means of assisting the traffic out of that area. I am just asking for maybe a study to be undertaken by the Police Department. It has been brought to the attention of the Police Department and I think they have initiated through Traffic some look at this.

Alderman O'Neil moved to refer this item to Police, Traffic and Highway for review and recommendation back to the Committee as soon as possible. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman DeVries asked where this also reaches into Londonderry for some needs for control do we need to somehow reach...would that be Southern NH Planning that we need to reach out to to assist us with planning in Londonderry.

Alderman O'Neil stated we probably should include the Planning Department in that motion in case there are any other potential development opportunities down there.

Mr. Lolicata asked this is just an engineering study to see if they need lights there right.

Alderman O'Neil answered I don't know if we need an engineering study. Sit down and talk and see what is going on there and what is the accident situation and when is it busy.

Mr. Lolicata stated I have already done that and I have made some clearances up there as far as people being able to see, etc. Like you said it is a problem during peak hours.

Alderman O'Neil asked if you did that have you shared that with Alderman DeVries.

Mr. Lolicata answered the Police have also been looking at accidents. I guess what it comes down to now is to find out if the warrants are there and like I said if you want an engineering study you can do it through CIP or the Airport...

Alderman O'Neil interjected we referred it to you to come back with a formal recommendation to us. Probably we should get the Planning Department involved. I think they can reach out to their people in Londonderry in similar positions. Also, we should probably include Airport as well.

TABLED ITEMS

10. Portion of report of Traffic Committee referred back to Committee
04/08/2003 regarding the adoption of regulations:

One-Way Streets:

Hollis Street

Kidder Street

This item remained on the table.

11. Report, if available, from the Building Commissioner and City Solicitor regarding speeding up the demolition process.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to remove Item 11 of the agenda.

Alderman Forest asked Leon in reference to this letter are we dealing with state statute here.

Mr. Leon LaFraniere answered yes.

Alderman Forest asked could you explain that please.

Mr. LaFreniere answered I will make an attempt at it, however, Atty. Arnold also co-authored this memo and speaking to the state statute portion of it he is probably better equipped to deal with. As I understood the reason behind this particular request, there was a concern that there is a considerable amount of time that the process takes before we have been able to in the past bring specific properties that have met the hazardous and dilapidated definition to the Board for your endorsement of our proceedings through the court process in RSA 155-B. The request was what can we do to accelerate that. We did investigate what the steps are. We took a look at the process and how we handle it on a specific basis here in Manchester. The conclusion really was that from a statutory standpoint we don't have a lot of flexibility to accelerate that process. The process is designed to protect Constitutional property rights. It is a comprehensive and complex process that requires the notification of all parties involved with the property including lienholders and ownership interests. So to change that process was not something that the Solicitor's Office and I don't want to speak for Tom but felt that we had a lot of flexibility to address. However, that said what we have done is change our approach to the process. When we have run into a property that we anticipate having problems with and that we anticipate we are going to have some difficulty in trying to gain compliance with to abate a hazardous and dilapidated condition we are initiating this much earlier in the process. This is still kind of a course of last resort for us because of the nature of the process in terms of what is involved and the expenses involved and the staff resources that are demanded as well as the structure of the statute. It really is designed to be a process of last resort. What we are doing, though, is initiating that process earlier. So we are utilizing our more conventional enforcement methods in terms of ordering compliance and issuing citations and so forth and then being better positioned to start this process

at an earlier stage than before. As I said, Tom can probably speak better to the statutory implications.

Alderman Forest stated what I can't understand with this is...I have seen some buildings ravaged by fire in this City that have been there for 10 or 12 years and have had all kinds of problems. I have gone to other towns and villages in this state where they require that buildings be torn down the next day so I can't understand why we are dealing with the state on this but maybe Tom Arnold can answer that one. I think that is why we sent this to you in the first place because some buildings were up for a long time that should have been demolished.

Chairman Sysyn stated I worked on one for three years.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated obviously state statute sets forth the procedure you must use to order a building owner to demolish the building and to recollect the expense to the City if the owner doesn't do it. Now that procedure requires that the building owner and any lienholders be notified, which requires a title search. It requires that a letter ordering them to do it go out and if they don't comply then we have to get an order from the Board so there are certain timeframes built in to the procedure, however, certainly not 10 or 12 years. If we work promptly and you have to keep in mind that court hearings are also required unless the property owner complies so to some extent we are at the mercy of the scheduling of the court but again not anything close to 10 to 12 years. My experience in the past is if we pursue it, it is probably a four, five or six month procedure by the time you add everything together and as Leon pointed out what we have attempted to do is where these buildings come to the City's attention usually as the result of a fire we try to speed up the internal process by which the City deals with it in terms of finding out who the owner is, notifying him, having Leon issue the notification to take the building down and getting to the Board if the owner does not.

Mr. LaFreniere stated if I could just add to that there have been some notable problem properties that we have dealt with in the past that have taken considerable time to address. Some of them frankly are still out there that we are dealing with now as Alderman Smith is well aware. In most cases those properties have presented us with specific challenges that have caused us to be stymied in the process set forth by statute. The property owners have either gone bankrupt or there is a bankruptcy involved or a change of ownership interest or inability to define ownership interest. There is a myriad of these things that have caused problems in the past in allowing us to proceed through the normal course on these things. I think that the typical process does not take that type of timeframe where you are you know seeing the property up for multiple years but there have been...I recognize that there are some notable exceptions and the way that the statutory limitations are configured we haven't had a lot of flexibility there because we

cannot proceed to act until we get a court order. We cannot get a court order while these items are outstanding.

Alderman O'Neil asked Leon do you recall off the top of your head what the shortest timeframe has been and what the longest has been. Ballpark? It is not a fair question but I thought those might stand out.

Mr. LaFreniere answered the shortest timeframe is the ideal situation where we have a property that suffers some damage, we order the building down and condemn the property and at the same time we solicit the Solicitor's Office's assistance in initiating the RSA 155-B process by starting a title search by putting together the paperwork necessary to proceed then you get compliance by the owner and the building comes down. That typically can be as short as a few weeks. Typically if there are insurance companies involved we are looking at a 60 to 90 day window. There are some notable exceptions as Alderman Sysyn is well aware. We had a property where we went through the RSA 155-B process and went to court with that several times and there was a bankruptcy involved. There was a death of an owner. There was...I think there were two transfers of the property before the order could take effect, which effectively caused us to have to start over again and that was at least four years before we were able to get that property down.

Alderman O'Neil asked so heading in this new direction that you and the Solicitor's Office have undertaken will speed up those that could be sped up.

Mr. LaFreniere answered we feel that it will and, in fact, I think we have had some fairly good results with this in part because we are being very up front with the property owners that we are having to order the properties down on and we are saying look this is the process we are initiating and if you don't comply we will have to take these further actions and it will result in additional expenses being incurred by you.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there an average like one to three a year or something.

Mr. LaFreniere answered that is probably not an unfair estimate. It certainly could be higher some years and less in other years but the properties that we have had to actually take through the RSA 155-B process are a little less than that. Probably less than one a year.

Alderman O'Neil asked was Auburn and Pine one of those.

Mr. LaFreniere answered yes and, in fact, it took us considerable time as you may be aware. That property was the subject of a criminal investigation and we couldn't act on that for a period of time until that matter was resolved.

Alderman O'Neil asked so we are heading in the right direction with this.

Mr. LaFreniere answered yes I think we are.

Alderman O'Neil stated thanks for the efforts from both departments.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to receive and file.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to remove the following item from the agenda.

Request to alter traffic patterns on Pearl and Orange Streets.

Chairman Sysyn asked Mr. Lolicata did anyone review this. Do we have a report on it?

Mr. Lolicata stated Fire, Police, Highway and myself all concurred to make Pearl Street a one-way easterly and Orange Street one-way westerly to allow the parking to take place between Chestnut and Union Streets. These people have nowhere to go and we can open it up and bring in more spaces so they can park in the streets. Mr. Dion is here.

On motion of Alderman Guinta, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to make Pearl Street a one-way, easterly, from Chestnut to Union Streets and to make Orange Street a one-way, westerly, from Chestnut to Union Streets.

Report regarding parking garage contract RFP's.

This item remained on the table.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to remove item 13 from the table:

Review of parking administration.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think we are ready to implement everything at this time but I think there was one thing that we wanted to kind of move on. I believe it is the Ordinance Violations Bureau.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated just to update the Committee based on some of the discussions and some of the requests that we have had in the office from some of the Aldermen on this Committee and on the Board in general and based on the communication that was received at the last meeting from the Police Department, our office proceeded to try and put together some kind of an organizational plan. We tried to determine how we might accommodate taking over some of the functions at least the functions in the Ordinance Violations Bureau. We also had requests and there was also the indication of the permitting, which is being done in two different departments at this point so to proceed any further what we have done is we have put together an organizational chart and we did ask the HR Department to review it. I can give you what I know of it because I did have a meeting with someone there today. At the end of this discussion I would hope to have some sense of direction of what the Committee would like us to proceed with or not with in terms of taking up people's time any further. The organizational chart would basically describe that if we took over those functions at minimum we would see that the two present clerks that are in that operation would be...similar positions would be created within the department of the City Clerk's Office because we could not take over the functions without additional staff. We are talking in essence of an upgrade to both of those positions to accommodate it because we would also cross-train them. If they are working at our counter they need to do other things, not just deal with ordinance violations. That portion of the reorganizational chart that I provided in the information, all indications are that HR would agree that those positions would have to be upgraded. In terms of the supervisory position as we understand it over there it is proposed at a labor grade 15 at this point in time and I guess there have been some discussions back and forth but we are saying that we would not take that position on at all, at least not initially. We don't see a need for that position if all of the other items that were supposed to be done are in process and my last discussion with Lt. Valenti was that the handhelds were on order and that process was proceeding so I am assuming that is. I think that if we take on this task we certainly would not want to do it in the time of a general Presidential election. We suspect that we would want some time to work out some detail and coordination with the Police Department and the staff that are there. That is where it is at at this point in time. We also would anticipate that Matthew's position would pick-up a lot of the supervisory duties and some other tasks in our own reorganization process and they are reviewing those and anything that might bump up the ladder along the way. We are kind of waiting for that to come back. HR indicated that they would finish their review this week so that is where it stands but I would like clarification on the other items as well.

Alderman O'Neil asked Carol in the interim are we able to help out Ordinance Violations at all or are they still on their own.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Lt. Valenti is here and he oversees that division of the Police Department but I think the way it is sitting at this point in time they are being provided assistance through the parking control officers or at least they were the last I knew. Until those handhelds physically come in and you get the rest of the stuff in process you are not going to see a whole lot of relief. I think by the time those are up and running my guess is we could start working some kind of a plan. There may be some ordinance changes needing to go through the HR process and certainly the Board would need to endorse anything that we are proposing here. I think our feeling now is that before we invest anymore time and we leave the people sitting over there hanging and not knowing what is happening to them we would like to get a more definitive direction from the Board. I don't know if you want Lt. Valenti to address where they are at over there now.

Alderman O'Neil stated it would probably be helpful if we could hear from Lt. Valenti.

Lt. Valenti stated currently we still have two employees down at Ordinance Violations, Janice and Karen. As you know they have been working there now without a supervisor per say for roughly 16 or 17 months. We have been trying to upgrade by going to a lock box system and using handheld machines, which would allow the tickets to go to the lock box system, thus giving relief to the workers. Tony Shaffer, myself, Karen, Janice, and the folks from Finance have all been working together. The timetable is probably the middle of October before we get the handhelds from the Cardinal company, which will allow the monies to be deposited into the lock box system. I know that Finance has opened an account at Citizens and also they have gotten a mailbox I believe. Last week we got a PO, which was provided to Tony Shaffer for the handhelds. We are moving forward and looking at the middle to the end of October as the time we hope to have implementation. I believe at first it is going to be the utilization of one for a pilot program and then slowly we will implement the others. Probably by the first of November the system should be up and running.

Alderman Forest asked Carol is there anything on this that we can implement tonight. I know you referenced the HR Committee and I would probably make a motion that we send this to them but is there anything on this we can implement tonight?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered I think some decisions have to be made. First of all if the intent is that the Clerk's Office is going to take over that portion of the operation the first thing I would like from the Committee is clarification as to what we are doing with the permitting process. Are we taking just the residential permitting or is it envisioned that all of that is coming because when we

talk about revenue collections we need to disseminate that. In terms of the parking tickets only, you know the collection of that revenue, I think they are proceeding with that. If we could send that portion forward to the Board with the vision that by the first of the year there are some transfers going and any required positional changes would go through the HR Committee we could incorporate that in one report to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. I think at this point there needs to be some endorsement by the full Board as to whether or not they want to move forward with those items as well at the recommendation of the Committee.

Alderman O'Neil asked Carol just going back to the conclusion of the report, some of these things we have already implemented or begun to implement, for instance the lock box.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered yes that is what he was just referring to.

Alderman O'Neil stated right that is a done deal. We have the agreement as Lt. Valenti said. The handhelds have been ordered and will be in some time in October?

Lt. Valenti responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am trying to recall did we do anything with any additional enforcement people.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded you financed them in the budget. I don't know where they stand on that.

Alderman O'Neil asked where do we stand on that.

Lt. Valenti stated those were two part-time PCO's. We are in the process of hiring those positions.

Alderman O'Neil stated okay so we have moved forward on those items. Is there anything else that I missed that we haven't...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected I think the only other thing I can recall are the meter collections that were being handled in the Traffic Department. I believe those are now...the monies are going to Traffic and then they were going to be directly deposited to the bank instead of being counted and I think Tom moved forward with Finance on those. You can check with him. There was another item in there about placing stuff on the web for informational purposes on the permitting and I am not sure...I really don't know where that stands. I know the Committee ordered it but I don't know where it stands.

Alderman O'Neil asked so meter collection, Tom, we worked on that deal with the bank...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected we have it going...as I understand it it was going to be going right to the bank.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that correct Tom.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated the other part of collections is the Ordinance Violations part and that is where you are looking for some direction from this Committee on.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied there was talk about the permitting, which is split up between the two departments.

Alderman O'Neil responded let's just stay on just collections. I don't know...they may be the same thing well not the same thing but under one roof I know is where we were trying to go but on collections you need some direction regarding Ordinance Violations and I think there is an agreement, am I correct, that I think the department agreed that it might be best served by being under the Clerk's Office. I don't want to put words in your mouth, Lieutenant.

Lt. Valenti replied that is my understanding yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated based on the letter from the Chief I think.

Lt. Valenti responded correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated let's talk about permitting then. Right now permitting is handled by how many different City departments?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded two.

Alderman O'Neil asked and that would be Traffic and who else.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered Ordinance Violations.

Alderman O'Neil asked and that is something that you need some direction from us on.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered well if the intent is that you are going to do the permitting all in one place, yes it needs to go in one place or the other. We are just not sure if that function is supposed to be coming over to our office or whether you are intending to leave it split between two departments or how you want that to work.

Alderman O'Neil stated just remind me what is Traffic doing for permitting versus Ordinance Violations.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied Ordinance Violations is issuing the residential parking permits.

Alderman O'Neil asked those are the ones that hang on the mirrors.

Lt. Valenti stated I believe it is a sticker.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I am not sure.

Alderman O'Neil stated and currently that is the only thing that Ordinance Violations is doing.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked and Traffic is doing...they must be doing the Millyard parking. Are you doing the Millyard parking Tommy?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated all of the lots, garages and on-street as I understand it.

Alderman O'Neil asked and on-street would include the bags...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected the bags and also there is permitting down in the UNH area.

Alderman O'Neil asked and again that is done with something that hangs on the mirror because I just want to make sure we are talking about the same thing as well as lease agreements in the lots and garages.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered yes that is the Traffic Department.

Chairman Sysyn stated do we need some motions on this.

Alderman Forest stated we need two motions. One to get the majority of this down to HR...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected I don't know whether...if the intent is to just take the positions that are going to require whatever I get back from the HR Department...let's say they say that Matthew's position needs to be reclassified to something else and that sort of thing, those items would need to go to HR by process anyway. What I am saying is I think the Committee needs to send a report to the full Board saying that you would like us to proceed and that you are requesting the Clerk's Office to work with the others and determine an effective date and submit whatever is necessary to the HR Committee. If, on the other hand, you would rather have them look at the whole process first and do the same process that you are doing, that is fine to. Whatever the Committee's choice is but I think the Committee has already gone through the report pretty thoroughly at this point and some of it is pretty clear cut.

Alderman Smith asked so you would have two additional part-time or two full-time PCO's.

Lt. Valenti answered part-time.

Alderman Smith stated okay so no fringe benefits. Okay now departments that issue permits for parking are Ordinance Violations and Traffic. Those are the only two at this stage right?

Lt. Valenti responded correct.

Alderman Smith asked can you tell me what the big problem is.

Alderman O'Neil stated I can give you my observation. I would think that for permitting you would want to have it all under one roof and you would want to make it available as convenient for the people needing to get the permits as possible. That is just my opinion.

Alderman Forest stated I will give you my comments from when I started this 18 months ago. I was looking for how many tickets were given in one area and how much was collected and I had to go through eight different departments to get the answer. That is when I started all of this. People have to go to three or four or five different departments to get answers on parking tickets and revenue and where it is going and where it is coming from. There was money that was given out for parking tickets that was sitting on desks for two or three months that weren't being deposited in the bank. The City was losing money. As far as permits, when a certain person is on vacation permits aren't being issued and I just

thought that putting all of these functions into one area like a Parking Control Manager or wherever. I mean you can put it anywhere you want but just to get all of these things together so that when a person comes in and has a question on a parking ticket or a parking meter they don't have to go to a half dozen different departments.

Alderman Smith stated I am looking at the cost. This is going to go to some department...it looks like the Tax Collector doesn't want it so it will have to go to the City Clerk's Office. Are they going to manage what the Traffic Department does now or what with the permits? What is the situation?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded the Clerk's Office will do whatever it is directed to do by the Board. It is not something that we are...I guess what I am saying is we were requested to do a report and in the report it outlined certain things and the permitting was included in there. It gives observations and recommendations and whatever the Committee decides to do with that is fine. The Parking Control Officers are already in the budget. You did that already as a Board of Mayor and Aldermen in June. That isn't part of anything or I don't think that is part of anything that we are really discussing at this point other than it has been done. In terms of the cost, until I get that report back from HR I can't give you definitives. We are recommending the elimination of one position in the process for Ordinance Violations. In terms of the Traffic Department, they are issuing the permits. If we take over the permits, we are proposing to do that without adding any staff in our department but we are going to have to readjust and reorganize within the department and that is all we are saying. We are doing alarm permitting. We are doing business licensing. We are doing taxi licenses. We are doing a whole array of things already so we are really just adding on a few more tasks here and there. I don't see it as being a major impact to the Clerk's budget other than we are saying that we need those two positions that are in Ordinance Violations and we feel they should be upgraded and be equal to the other Customer Service Representatives that are in our office.

Alderman Smith stated if there is a problem like if the meter is...who is going to do it if it is not working properly. You are still going to call the Traffic Department down and they are going to monitor the parking meters. What is the situation? I want to get a handle on who is going to do what.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded at this point in the process that is what I was asking for was some direction. We are saying that Ordinance Violations does two things. They are doing collections and they are doing permitting. Traffic is doing permitting as well and they are doing collections of the meters. There are three positions that go out and collect the monies. I certainly would not advocate that the Clerk's Office take all three of those functions over immediately. I don't

know whether the Committee's intention as to bring all of those collections together eventually but I think that if nothing else the permitting should probably be addressed at this point.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think you need to crawl before you walk before you run and I agree with Carol that I think trying to come up with a solution for an entire parking system in one swoop would be wrong. I do believe that having one central place to get a permit makes sense. That is good service to the users of our parking system. It is convenient. I know in the case of the Clerk's Office you have hours of 8 AM until 5 PM but there are some nights you are open and there are Saturdays you are open and I think that only improves not only in the collections but in the permitting the service to the citizens of the City and those that are doing business in the City. I think those are two positive steps myself. That all permitting comes under one roof and that the collections regarding Ordinance Violations come under one roof. I don't think we are ready to address the other part of collections at this time. I am not, anyway.

Chairman Sysyn asked so you are saying that all of the permit parking would be taken away from the Traffic Department and go to the City Clerk's Office.

Alderman O'Neil answered yes. That was a recommendation in the report.

Chairman Sysyn stated but Traffic does most of the permit parking now don't they.

Alderman O'Neil responded they do but unfortunately because really to the best of my knowledge there is only one person who does it that is for a limited time period and if that person is not there no permits are given out.

Chairman Sysyn asked is that true Tom.

Mr. Lolicata answered Denise has been in charge of permits for six years. There are over 3,000 of them. If anybody comes in and she is not there, we give out permits.

Chairman Sysyn asked so you still give out the permits if she isn't there.

Mr. Lolicata answered sure we can depending on whether we have enough or they are filled up.

Alderman O'Neil asked and what hours are those given out.

Mr. Lolicata answered we are open from 7 AM to 3:30 PM.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think that is convenient for the people who need to do it. I like the extended 8 AM to 5 PM with some nights and weekends to be honest with you and there is no cost for us to do that.

Mr. Lolicata answered all permits are mailed out and paid by the month. The only time they come in is once a year to renew. Outside of that new people come in.

Alderman O'Neil stated I still think one central place for permits is the right way to go with extended time to do it.

Chairman Sysyn stated I like the early morning hours myself but whatever.

Alderman O'Neil stated I find it hard to believe, in all honesty, that we have a City agency that is only open from 7 AM until 3 PM.

Alderman O'Neil moved to begin the process for Ordinance Violations to be phased in to be part of the City Clerk's Office and that the process starts regarding HR. Do we need to do any other ordinance changes regarding that?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded we really need to wait for the report from HR in order to know what we are going to ask for.

Alderman O'Neil replied maybe we should take them one at a time. I will move on that.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion to move Ordinance Violations to the City Clerk's Office. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Smith being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman O'Neil moved that all permitting be put under one roof in the City Clerk's Office. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Smith being duly recorded in opposition.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can we just add that that be phased in at the discretion of the Clerk and the departments so we can work that out.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is going to take a little time anyway.

14. Report of the Traffic Committee recommending that all metered parking be changed from Monday-Friday, 8AM-8PM to Monday-Friday, 8AM-6PM.

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Guinta asked are we any farther along on what you and I, Tom, were talking about at Bridge and Elm.

Mr. Lolicata responded regarding parking.

Alderman Guinta asked did you get my follow-up e-mail.

Mr. Lolicata replied no I just got your original e-mail and I answered you.

Alderman Guinta asked you didn't get a follow-up from me.

Mr. Lolicata answered I am sorry but I didn't.

Alderman Guinta stated in my follow-up my question was could we somehow ask the people to utilize Bedford Street rather than Hollis and Kidder.

Mr. Lolicata responded we did. There will be over 85 people using this. Say for example they all left just like you want. Say they are all not there. It is still open to the public. Someone can come right in and buy a permit there anyway. It is a public parking place with meters.

Alderman Guinta replied I understand that but before the construction started that never happened, that situation. So the residents on Hollis and Kidder Streets all had ample parking. Since the construction started the residents are not able to park on their own street. I am not trying to penalize the construction workers. I am just asking if we can ask them rather than buy spots on Hollis and Kidder if they can just buy them on Bedford Street. That is actually just as close.

Mr. Lolicata stated I have had nobody come in for quite awhile. That first rush of workers that you see out there right now are maybe about 30, 40 or 50 of them.

Alderman Guinta stated I was wondering if we could ask somebody over there to transfer it from the current location to Bedford Street just so the residents have someplace to park.

Mr. Lolicata responded I will talk to the foreman and see if I can get something going like that for both streets.

Alderman Forest stated I am sure this is old business and I may have missed getting it in but I asked Tom about the handicapped bags to put over the meters. Apparently Tom has worked out the handicapped parking around the Verizon arena on event nights.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Guinta, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee